

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04396 141607Z

42

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 SS-20 MC-02 ACDA-19 SAM-01 SAJ-01

NSC-07 EURE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 USIE-00 CIAE-00

PM-07 INR-11 L-03 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03

TRSE-00 NIC-01 DRC-01 /122 W  
----- 067114

O R 141455Z AUG 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 7152

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 4396

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE: AUGUST 13 POLADS DISCUSSION OF UK PAPER ON CBMS

GENEVA FOR CSCE DEL

REF: (A) STATE 176397

(B) USNATO 4356

BEGIN SUMMARY: UK PAPER ON CBMS (REF B) CIRCULATED TOO LATE FOR MOST DELEGATIONS TO HAVE RECEIVED INSTRUCTED COMMENTS. IN ADDITION TO PRESENTING PAPER, UK REP SUGGESTED THAT ALLIES RECOGNIZE WE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO ATTAIN ALL OUR CBM AIMS IN CURRENT CSCE PHASE AND SHOULD LEAVE OPEN POSSIBILITY OF IMPROVEMENT ON CBMS IN A CSCE FOLLOW-UP PHASE. BRITISH SUGGESTION MET CONSIDERABLE RESISTANCE FROM OTHER DELEGATIONS. FRG REP SUGGESTED DEVELOPING A COMMON NATO DETAILED INTERPRETATION OF TEXT AGREED TO IN GENEVA ON EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS. ACTION REQUESTED: DEPARTMENT'S VIEWS ON (A) GERMAN SUGGESTION FOR COMMON NATO DETAILED INTERPRETATION OF EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS TEXT, (B) UK CBMS PAPER AND (C) UK SUGGESTION RE CBMS IN A CSCE FOLLOW-UP CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 04396 141607Z

PHASE. END SUMMARY.

1. UK PAPER ON CBMS (REF B) CIRCULATED TOO LATE FOR MOST DELEGATIONS TO HAVE RECEIVED INSTRUCTED COMMENTS, BUT

SEVERAL REPS GAVE PERSONAL VIEWS WHICH COMPLIMENTED BRITISH EFFORT BUT ALSO RAISED SPECIFIC CRITICISMS. IPN PRESENTING PAPER, UK REP NOTED IT WAS A GENERAL STATEMENT INTENDED TO SERVE AS A BASIS FOR MORE DETAILED DISCUSSIONS. IN ADDITION TO VIEWS PRESENTED IN PAPER, UK AUTHORITIES BELIEVE NATO ALLIES SHOULD RECOGNIZE THE POSSIBILITY THAT WE MAY BE UNABLE TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE EAST A TEXT ON CBMS WHICH MEETS ALL ALLIED OBJECTIVES. HMG THINKS THAT NATO ALLIES SHOULD THEREFORE WORK FOR A TEXT THAT EMPHASIZES THE IMPORTANCE OF CBMS AND COULD SERVE AS A BASIS FOR "FURTHER DEVELOPMENT" OF CBMS IF SOME FORM OF CSCE FOLLOW-UP IS AGREED UPON. UK REP EMPHASIZED HE WAS NOT SUGGESTING THAT CBMS BE PUT OFF UNTIL A FOLLOW-UP PHASE OF CSCE, BUT THAT THE TEXT ON CBMS COULD LEAVE OPEN THE POSSIBILITY OF IMPROVEMENT.

2. A NUMBER OF DELEGATIONS EXPRESSED RESERVATIONS ON BRITISH SUGGESTION OF POSSIBLE CBM WORK IN A CSCE FOLLOW-UP PHASE. THE FRENCH REP THOUGHT THIS PROCEDURE COULD CREATE A BAD PRECEDENT. THIS VIEW WAS ECHOED BY DUTCH REP, WHO TERMED PROCEDURE "DANGEROUS". TURKISH REP EXPRESSED SIMILAR VIEW. FRG REP SAID WHOLE QUESTION OF CSCE FOLLOW-UP NEEDS CAREFUL AND DETAILED EXAMINATION.

3. IN COMMENTING ON BRITISH PAPER ON CBMS, OTHER DELEGATIONS SAID THEY HAD NOT YET RECEIVED REACTIONS FROM THEIR CAPITALS. ITALIAN REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES MIGHT HAVE DIFFICULTIES WITH FORMULATION IN PARAGRAPH 2 ON VOLUNTARY NOTIFICATION OF SEPARATE AIR AND NAVAL MANEUVERS. HE POINTED OUT THAT WESTERN DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENTS MIGHT NOTIFY SUCH MANEUVERS WHEREAS THE SOVIETS MIGHT NOT, THEREBY CREATING AN IMBALANCE. SIMILARLY, HE THOUGHT THAT THE UK PAPER'S LANGUAGE ON VOLUNTARY NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS WOULD BE DISADVANTAGEOUS TO THE WEST.

4. FRENCH REP SAID GOF BELIEVES SUCCESS OF CSCE DOES NOT DEPEND ON CBMS BUT HAD NEVERTHELESS AGREED TO INCLUSION OF CBMS IN NEGOTIATIONS. HE STRESSED FRENCH VIEW THAT PROGRESS MUST BE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 04396 141607Z

BASED ON REAL, CONCRETE STEPS, NOT ILLUSORY ONES. HE SUGGESTED THAT UK PAPER'S PARAGRAPH 4, ON EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS, COULD BE DELETED SINCE THERE HAD BEEN TENTATIVE AGREEMENT IN GENEVA ON THE EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS (GENEVA 4789). FRG REP SAID TEXT ON EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS AS AGREED IN GENEVA WAS VAGUE AND THAT PERHAPS A COMMON NATO INTERPRETATION COULD BE DEVELOPED TO ASSIST OUR NEGOTIATORS. RELEVANT QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED COULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING: (A) TYPES OF MANEUVERS; (B) WHO WOULD ISSUE INVITATIONS; (C) FORM OF INVITATIONS; (D) WHAT KINDS OF OBSERVERS; AND (E) RIGHTS ENJOYED BY OBSERVERS.

5. TURKISH REP SAID THAT LAST SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 2 OF BRITISH PAPER (NOTIFICATION OF SEPARATE AIR AND NAVAL

MANEUVERS) APPEARED TO BE AN ATTEMPT TO HARMONIZE ALLIED VIEWS ON THIS SUBJECT. RE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS, TURKISH REP SAID HE UNDERSTOOD INFORMAL CONSENSUS HAD DEVELOPED IN NATO CAUCUS IN GENEVA AND THEN READ TEXT REPORTED PARAGRAPH 5 OF GENEVA 4790. HE ADDED THAT SINCE NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS WAS COVERED IN THE HELSINKI RECOMMENDATIONS, THE ALLIES COULD NOT SIMPLY DROP THE MATTER. TURKISH REP SUGGESTED THAT FURTHER STUDY BE GIVEN IN NATO TO THIS TEXT AND ASKED WHETHER U.S. COULD ACCEPT GENEVA NATO CAUCUS TEXT.

6. U.S. REP STATED THAT U.S. CONTINUES TO OPPOSE ANY CBM ON MOVEMENTS. USG HAD RECEIVED UK PAPER ON CBMS TOO LATE TO GIVE IT DETAILED STUDY, BUT OUR PRELIMINARY REACTION WAS THAT WE PREFER PRECISE TEXTUAL FORMULATIONS, CONTRARY TO WHAT IS ADVOCATED, FOR EXAMPLE, IN PARAGRAPH 6D OF UK PAPER.

7 THE FRG REP STATED VIEW THAT NATO DISCUSSIONS ON CBMS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO FORMULATING GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE GENEVA NEGOTIATORS SO AS TO GIVE THE NEGOTIATORS ENOUGH FLEXIBILITY. THIS VIEW WAS ECHOED BY GREEK, TURKISH, DUTCH, UK AND CANADIAN REPS.

8. IN SUMMING UP DISCUSSION ON BRITISH PAPER, CHAIRMAN EXPRESSED HOPE THAT MORE DETAILED EXAMINATION OF IT COULD TAKE PLACE AT NEXT POLADS MEETING, AUGUST 20. HE ALSO RAISED QUESTION OF HOW TO PRESENT PAPER TO NAC. SEVERAL DELEGATIONS SAID THIS DECISION NEED NOT BE TAKEN NOW, BUT COULD BE MADE IN LIGHT OF FURTHER DISCUSSIONS.  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 04396 141607Z

9. ACTION REQUESTED: DEPARTMENT'S VIEWS ON (A) GERMAN SUGGESTION (PARAGRAPH 4) FOR COMMON NATO DETAILED INTERPRETATION OF EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS TEXT, (B) UK CBMS PAPER AND (C) UK SUGGESTION RE CBMS IN A CSCE FOLLOW-UP PHASE.  
MCAULIFFE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 14 AUG 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** garlanwa  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO04396  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740888/abbrywqd.tel  
**Line Count:** 147  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** (A) STATE 176397  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** garlanwa  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 10 APR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <10 APR 2002 by martinml>; APPROVED <01-Oct-2002 by garlanwa>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CSCE: AUGUST 13 POLADS DISCUSSION OF UK PAPER ON CBMS  
**TAGS:** PFOR, PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
**SECDEF INFO GENEVA**  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005